

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the admitted prior art in view of the patents to Cho and Dorfman.

Claims 7-9 are rejected as claim 6, and further in view of the patent to Ross.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as claim 6 and further in view of the patent to Sullivan.

Also, claim 4 is objected to.

In connection with the Examiner's rejections and objections, applicant has canceled claim 1.

Claim 6 has been amended, and additional claims 13 has been added.

The retained dependent claim which deal with a toy structure have been made dependent on claim 12. Applicant has also canceled claim 10 and submitted a new independent claim 14 which combines the features of the original claims 6, 7 and 10.

Turning now to the references and particularly to the patents Cho and Dorfman, it can be seen that none of these references disclose parts which must be connected to one another by adhesion, of which at least one of the parts becomes adhesive by moistening. Also, none of the elements to be adhesively connected with one another is composed of a solid foam. The both shells 10 of the toy egg of the patent to Cho are composed of a hard synthetic plastic material, such as polyethylene, polypropylene, etc. as explained in column 2, starting from line 1. This reference does not disclose either a foam, or a material which can become adhesive by moistening. Also, this reference does not contain any hint or suggestion for the use of starch. Cho discloses a water-soluble adhesive in column 1, line 29, which however can not be compared with starch.

The patent to Dorfman also does not disclose toy blocks which are adhesively connected with one another by moistening. After dissolution of an outer package the parts contained in the package are not dissolved in

the water bed and adhesively connected with one another, but they are maintained individually and separately from one another. This presumes that the parts which are contained in the package disclosed in the patent to Dorfman are not water-soluble.

A further significant difference of the applicant's invention from the solutions proposed in the references is that both in the patent to Cho and in the patent to Dorfman the adhesive connection is dissolved by water contact, and the adhesive connection is not provided as in the applicant's invention. This is exactly opposite to the solution proposed in the applicant's invention, in accordance with which the adhesive connection is produced instead of dissolved.

An additional difference of the present invention is that none of the references discloses a solid foam as a toy block to be adhesively connected. Neither the shells of the patent to Cho nor the figure and the individual parts of the patent to Dorfman are composed of a foam. Also, in the patents to Ross and Sullivan there are no solid foams.

It is therefore believed to be clear that none of the references teaches a toy block or a similar block which is composed of a solid foam and

is adhesively connected by molstening, and none of the references discloses a method of manufacturing in accordance with the present invention.

The patent to Dorfman in column 4, line 1, discloses the starch as an adhesive.

The additional features of the present invention as now defined in claims 13 and 14 are not disclosed in the references as well. Claim 14 defines that the solid foam is triturated to form a pourable material, and scattering is performed onto the other element after the starch in liquid form has been applied to the other element. Neither the patent to Ross nor the patent to Sullivan disclose these features of the present invention. Also, the flocking in the patents to Ross and Sullivan is sprayed together with a binding agent, and not first the starch is applied in a liquid form and subsequently crushed foam is dispersed.

It is respectfully submitted that the new features of the present invention which are now defined in the independent claims are not disclosed in the references and can not be derived from them as a matter of obviousness. These claims should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, the dependent claims depend on the corresponding independent claims, they share their presumably allowable features, and therefore they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233